

Pamph
RTheol.

H

STAND FAST IN THE FAITH:

A

SERMON,

PREACHED IN CURZON CHAPEL, MAY FAIR,

ON SUNDAY, NOV. 3, 1850.

BY

ERNEST HAWKINS, B.D

MINISTER OF CURZON CHAPEL.

WITH A PREFACE AND APPENDIX.

“If the comparison be made between the Roman Church and ours, he is stark blind that sees not to which the preference is due.”—BISHOP BULL

Published by Request.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1850.



3 1761 09622900 0

324553^a
17. 2. 36.

LONDON:
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

P R E F A C E.

THE reason of the publication of the following Sermon appears on the title-page; and though the Author replied to the request there alluded to by an offer to point out various treatises in which the subject was fully and satisfactorily handled, he could not meet the rejoinder that some few (especially among those who stand in a certain spiritual relation to him) might be induced to read a short Sermon, who would have neither the leisure nor the disposition to study a large volume.

A Sermon so published will not, of course, be judged of in the same manner as an Essay elaborately prepared for the press; but the Author has endeavoured to give some value to the publication, by appending to it a few weighty sentences on the characteristic tenets of popery from the great

champions of the Church of England. Those who have time to enter fully into the subject are referred to the works of Jewel, Hall, Bramhall, Laud, Sander-son, Taylor, Barrow, and Bull.

The protest, be it remembered, which was solemnly recorded at the time of the Reformation, and the war which we have still to wage, are not against the Church of Rome as such, but against her fatal errors; her many corruptions of Scriptural truth. The impostures by which she has all along attempted to accredit them are still practised and encouraged as largely as ever: for it surely requires something more than charity not to suspect that those who authorized the exhibition of the "holy coat" of Treves; those who yearly exhibit the pretended miracle of the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius; and those who ascribe supernatural effects to certain pictures of the Madonna, are knowingly and purposely deceiving the people. When truth is thus tampered with, the foundations of the faith are undermined. Against such fearful abuses and delusions, then, the Church of England must maintain a constant *protest*; but it is her function not only to protest against Romish error, but to uphold Catholic truth; and this can only be done by a resolute and

consistent assertion of her own distinctive principles. Much, indeed, is it to be hoped that the late daring aggression on our Church may induce all her true sons to lay aside party differences, and rally as one man in her defence; for well might she laugh to scorn all attacks from without, were she only united within. Much, also, is it to be hoped that the invasion of a foreign enemy, whose strength is derived mainly from the completeness of his organization, may hasten the restoration, in some form or other, of the organic action of our own Church. The present irregular and desultory efforts to repel a most insidious attack,—efforts in which it is a satisfaction to know that the Clergy have taken the lead,—show at what disadvantage we are fighting, and how desirable it is that the whole Church, Clergy and Laity, duly represented in a Council of her own, should have the liberty of speaking and acting for herself:—for otherwise “how shall we be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against us with twenty thousand?”

Lastly, it is hoped that the Church may be awakened by recent encroachments to the danger of leaving her own strong positions any longer unoccupied. Each county, at least, should have its own

Bishopric. The extension of the Episcopate would assuredly be followed by a large increase in the number of the Clergy.

The policy which has been so abundantly blessed in the Colonies, would hardly be unsuccessful at home.

79, PALL MALL,

November 9, 1850.

* * * *In the following Sermon the letters refer to authorities cited
in the Appendix.*

A

S E R M O N¹,

&c.

1 COR. xvi. 13.

“ Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.”

THERE is something strikingly true and real in the character of St. Paul. Whatever he does or says is distinguished by a bold, simple, and manly spirit. He never exhibits any symptoms of fear, concealment, or hesitation. Before his conversion he was an open and avowed persecutor ; not doing his work by halves, but making havoc without mercy of all who believed. So too, after his call, he displayed the same daring courage, the same unfaltering constancy, in the service of his Divine Master. Once

¹ The Sermon (since slightly altered) had been preached at the chapel of the Hon. Society of Lincoln's Inn on the preceding Sunday.

brought to a conviction of the truth, St. Paul manfully girds himself for the Christian warfare, and fights to the last the good fight of faith. He accepts the commission of Jesus, and goes forth to a life of toil, and care, and suffering; of hard fare and ignominious treatment; nay, even to a death of martyrdom, in the full faith of the revelation which he had received, and of the promises which were set before him. The same character is stamped upon his writings. He seems to aim at conveying to his converts the great principles of the faith—the substance, so to speak, of Christianity—in strong and intelligible language. Broadly he lays down the fundamental points, that all mankind were lying under the condemnation of God; that Christ died for all; that justification is through faith in Him; that there will be a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust; and that every man will be judged according to his works. Such are the great subjects on which the Apostle dwells, and which form, as it were, the staple of his preaching. Truly, indeed, was he able to say that he had not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God. A complete body of doctrine may be compiled from his Epistles; yet it will be found that his manner was to keep the mind of his disciples fixed upon the great and governing principles of religion. He frequently cautions them not to be diverted from essential truth or plain duty by questions of secondary or of merely occasional importance. Thus, to guard

against the minute and frivolous disputations of the Gnostics or other Sophists, he reminds Timothy of his original instructions—to charge his presbyters at Ephesus that they “give no heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith ².” He does not, however, conclude with this negative caution, but proceeds to give a plain, practical lesson, eminently characteristic of his teaching: “Now the end of the commandment is charity, out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned.”

A similar instance occurs in his letter to Titus, another governor of the Church; but here the order is reversed, and the positive commandment precedes the caution as to what is to be avoided: “This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men. But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain ³.”

The young converts, in the Apostle’s time, were, not unnaturally, perplexed about the duty of conforming to certain requirements of the Mosaic Law. Were they, for example, bound to observe the distinction between clean and unclean meats? Were they to follow the Jewish Calendar in the celebra-

² 1 Tim. i. 4.

³ Tit. iii. 8, 9.

tion of certain days? What is St. Paul's answer? He enters into no nice and ingenious discussion of the particular controversy; but enjoins them to be governed in all such matters by the rule of charity. In all cases, where no law of God bound them to a particular course, they were to be guided by a consideration of the spiritual good of others: and this on the grand Christian principle, that "none of us liveth unto himself." By another body of converts, the Corinthians, St. Paul is consulted as to the expediency of marriage in those unquiet times, and the duties of the married. On these topics he gives, it is true, some rather minute directions; but he seems to subordinate them all to the solemn reflections—"The time is short," "the fashion of this world passeth away;" reflections which must prove the best rule of action to those who feel the relative importance of this life and the next. These references may suffice to show how faithfully the writings of St. Paul reflect his character, the character of a resolute, truthful, and single-minded man; one who kept his eye fixed upon the great end to be attained; and allowed no inferior objects to divert him from it. This is a subject which admits of full and various illustration. The words of the text alone go far to display the characteristic qualities of St. Paul's mind. They are distinct, unequivocal, concise. They sound like the last instructions of a general to his troops on the eve of a battle. Let us ponder them well. Let us try to

ascertain their full meaning; and see what application they may have to us and to our times.

These, then, are the solemn and weighty injunctions which he gives to the Corinthians, just after that wonderful chapter on the resurrection of the body. "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong." They have, probably, reference to the awful heresy, so powerfully refuted in the last chapter, of those who denied the doctrine of the resurrection. They seem almost certainly to have been drawn forth by some insidious attack on the Christian faith—to convey a caution against apostasy, and an earnest encouragement to steadfastness and constancy. I will at once say, however, that my object is not to investigate the question of their original meaning and use; but to employ them as strikingly applicable to ourselves in the present very peculiar circumstances of the Church. Those circumstances, it will hardly be denied, are such as to demand especial watchfulness. It is no longer by a war of posts that we are harassed. We are threatened with the invasion of a powerful and organised army. Our citadel is summoned to surrender, and the cries are already heard of "Down with it, down with it, even to the ground." This may sound like extravagant rhapsody; but let me only remind you of a few astounding facts which have been brought to our knowledge within the last fortnight; and the simple truth will seem like fable—so strange and almost incredible is it.

There appears to be no ground for doubting that a document which all must have seen in the public papers is authentic ; and therefore that the Bishop of Rome, blasphemously assuming to himself the lordship over the universal Church of Christ, has mapped out the whole of this country into Dioceses, and authorised Ecclesiastics named by himself to usurp the titles of Bishops thereof. This, it is argued by some, is nothing more than a mere change of names, and may be safely disregarded as a matter of no moment. It might perhaps be sufficient to reply that the Romish Church is not in the habit of adopting any course without a purpose ; and we may be sure she would not be guilty of the weakness of exciting jealousy by the change of titles, if she had no further and more important object in view. Moreover, it is a shallow observation to say, that no importance belongs to names and titles. Such a proposition can hardly be seriously maintained in such a state of society as ours. But however this may be, we are not so ignorant of the theory of the Papacy as not to know that wherever the Pope establishes a See, he claims for the Bishop of his appointment an absolute and *exclusive* jurisdiction. He denies the right and authority of the existing Bishop ; declares him an intruder ; and, as far as he can, deposes him (A).

The recent Bull, then, or Decree of the Vatican, inasmuch as it partitions out the whole of England and Wales into Romish Sees, does nothing less than

pronounce sentence against the English Church; declaring it to be no Church at all; proclaiming its Bishops to be usurpers of Sees that of right belong to others; denying the validity of the orders of its Clergy; and treating the Laity as heretics, if not as heathen. Is it then, I ask, possible to exaggerate the audacity and insolence of such a measure on the part of a Foreign Power? One is sometimes tempted to regard it as a piece of grotesque and extravagant pleasantry; but however futile the project may prove, it is seriously meant, and must be seriously dealt with. As then we are summoned, and—to use the emphatic and out-spoken language of a chief organ of the Ultra-montane party—are summoned under pain of *damnation* to submit ourselves without delay to the Episcopal nominees of the Sovereign Pontiff, it may be well to examine both the position which we are called upon to surrender, and that which we are so peremptorily enjoined to occupy. The case may thus be stated:—We, members of Christ's Holy Catholic Church in this country, are, by an act altogether without precedent, required, as we tender our salvation, to abandon our own Holy Mother—the Mother of so many saints, of so many champions of the faith—the nurse, it may without boasting be said, of as much piety, learning, and devotion, of as much charity and patriotism, of as much domestic and public virtue as have done honour to any country—this, the Church of our fathers, we are required, for our souls' safety, to

abandon, and fly for refuge to the ark of Rome (B). Plainly, then, our assumed danger must be in respect to those points wherein the Church of England has presumed to differ from the Church of Rome. Some of the chief of these it may be proper briefly to notice. But before doing so, let me mention how far we occupy common ground. We agree in holding the three Creeds, or confessions of faith, known and accepted by the early Church. We, as well as they, believe in the inspiration of Scripture, and in sacramental grace. We, as well as they, acknowledge the threefold order of the Christian ministry, and require, to constitute a valid commission, ordination, by the laying on of the hands of a Bishop. But, to go no further, it may be shortly said, that we hold every doctrine which Rome holds in common with the Catholic Church of the first six centuries; and we differ from Rome, where Rome differs from universal Christian antiquity (C). But, to specify a few main points.—Holding the doctrine of Christ's real, that is, His spiritual presence in the Holy Eucharist, we reject the mediæval figment of *transubstantiation*, as unknown to the Primitive Church, inconsistent with the language of early Christian writers⁴, and, in fact, an innovation of the thirteenth century (D). But if we protest against this carnal interpretation of the words of Scripture, we protest no less distinctly

⁴ I take this opportunity of strongly recommending Professor Blunt's University Sermons, preached in November, 1849.

against the violence done to them, even to our Lord's own words, in refusing the cup to the Laity, in plain opposition to the solemn and pathetic injunction at the last supper, when, having given thanks, He gave the cup to His disciples, and said, "Drink ye all of this" (E). Is this arbitrary withholding of a most blessed privilege and means of grace a reason why the Laity should desert the Church where the Lord's Supper is administered faithfully, according to the obvious meaning of Scripture, and the undoubted practice of the first Christians? Another striking and remarkable difference in the customs of the two Communion is, that, according to the Romish ritual, the Mass is celebrated, and Prayers and Psalms are said and sung, in a strange language, a language not understood by one in one hundred of the people (F). Is this a privilege or a disadvantage? is it reasonable, or contrary to reason? It certainly is a practice totally irreconcilable with the injunctions of St. Paul, and least of all is it calculated to edify. How then has it happened, that the worship of the early Church, which is well known to have been *congregational*, and conducted in the language of the people, has been converted into a service doubly unprofitable, as being said in a foreign tongue, and in an almost inaudible tone, and so made to resemble "a pageant for ignorant spectators⁵," rather than the common supplication and thanksgiving of Priest and people? This is another question which should be satisfactorily

⁵ Blunt, p. 39.

answered, before we can be expected to forego our own reasonable service for the ceremonial worship of the middle ages.

Similarly unscriptural, unprimitive, and uncatholic is the more than veneration paid to images in the Romish Communion. Without affirming that the honour so given constitutes in itself a breach of the second commandment, there can be no doubt that the introduction of the carved images of saints and martyrs into the Christian sanctuary has led thousands and tens of thousands of ignorant worshippers into practical idolatry. If it be not actually forbidden in Scripture, this abuse can at least claim no sort of Scriptural foundation; and that it has no warrant in the Primitive Church, is proved by the fact that the heathens charged the early Christians with being Atheists, *i. e.* with worshipping no God at all, because they saw no statue of a god within the Christian temples (G).

Again, let it be borne in mind that those who may be thinking of submitting to the imperious claims of Rome, must adopt, not such a system as may be ingeniously defended in the pages of apologists, but the system which exists in practice, the only one which is known to the people at large (H).

This distinction should be well marked, otherwise there will be room for evasion. For example: when accused of withholding God's Word from the people, the Romanists will refer to many well-known editions of the Holy Scriptures, mostly voluminous and

costly; but it is nevertheless certain that the circulation of God's Word is generally prohibited or discouraged, and that its contents are consequently unknown to the vast majority. Practically the Bible is a sealed volume in countries subject to the spiritual jurisdiction of Rome. Yet Jesus says, "Search the Scriptures;" and St. Paul and St. Peter both enjoin us to be furnished with the grounds and reasons of our faith (I) ⁶.

One more most important discrepancy between the Churches of Rome and England,—the honour paid to the Virgin Mary. Highly favoured indeed is she among women, and called and esteemed "blessed" by us, as by every generation since the day of the angel Gabriel's visit. Her song of thanksgiving is recited in our daily service, and two especial festivals are observed by our Church, in which the honour done to the Mother of our Lord is commemorated. But we acknowledge that the distance which separates the most honoured of created beings from Godhead is infinite; whereas, in the Roman Church, not, perhaps, by a formal decree or canon, but by encouragement and in practice, the Virgin Mother is made the object of popular worship,—is represented with a crown on her head, and the world at her feet,—and is addressed as the Queen of Heaven (K). I have no time to speak of many other

⁶ England was furnished with the first entire translation of the Bible in the vernacular tongue by Wycliffe, who may justly be termed the great harbinger of the Reformation, A. D. 1380.

abuses, or corruptions of truth, as the Romish doctrine of purgatory, indulgences (L), privileged altars, the multiplication of intercessors (M), the canonization of dead men. These we must pass with the simple question, Do they *look like* doctrines and practices drawn from Scripture, or from man's invention? Can any thing of the sort, or approaching to it, be found in the writings of St. Paul, or of the other Apostles, or even of their successors, for three centuries at least? And if not, can those who have the open oracles of God in their hands, and the fullest means of ascertaining the primitive belief and practice of the Church, accept for Divine law such a mass of mere human traditions? But possibly *this* objection may be taken to the line of argument which I have adopted:—If (it may be said) the teaching of the Church of Rome vary in so many important particulars, not only from the standard of Scripture, but from the well-ascertained practice of Christian antiquity, it cannot be difficult to convict it of such variations, and to show how and when the several innovations have been introduced. Now, this is precisely what has been done again and again; done, too, so completely and conclusively, that the most consistent and logical party of that communion have *abandoned the ground of antiquity* as indefensible, and have taken refuge in the modern theory of *development* (N). This is virtually a surrender of all just claim to Catholicity; it is admitting the existence of articles of belief which cannot be traced to

the Primitive Church, and that the creed of Rome is no longer identical with that which was taught by the Apostles. Let it, therefore, be well understood, that, as it is forcibly expressed in words of authority only yesterday addressed by our own Diocesan to his Clergy, "Whoever desires to be in communion with the Church of Rome, must be prepared to embrace that system in all its fulness and complexity; every item of all the errors and superstitions which have at any time received the stamp of Papal infallibility; and not only so, but every *new* doctrine and practice which the same authority may from time to time impose upon the Church." The Bishop adds, with equal point and truth,—“It is not easy to say what the members of that Church are required to believe *now*; it is impossible for men to foresee what they may be called upon to admit as an article of faith next year, or in any future year.”

But, say the forced partisans of the new theory, the Church has been growing from the first. Each century has contributed something towards its perfection, and so the body of divine doctrine, which we of the Church of England consider to have been completed with the last words of the last surviving Apostle, continues to be enlarged by constant accretions. The commission given to St. Peter is continued to his successor in the See of Rome; our Lord has still his representative and vicegerent upon earth,

one whose infallibility settles every question beyond the power of appeal, and dispenses both with proof and with authority (O).

This is indeed the foundation-stone of the entire system,—the master-fraud of all,—but is itself based upon nothing but the weakness and credulity of men. How utterly the impious claim of an infallible judgment has been confuted and covered with ridicule, by the incompatible and contradictory judgment of various Popes, let history tell. Yet are we summoned to surrender both our own reason, and the plain meaning of Scripture, to the dicta of an infallibility which has never for long together been consistent with itself (P). Against any such compromise St. Paul emphatically warns us,—“ Watch ye, stand fast in the faith;” *the faith*, not as from time to time interpreted or modified by Popes, but the faith “once delivered to the saints;” the faith as contained in Holy Writ, and held by the Universal Church in the first centuries. But, hitherto, it seems,—for refusing to acknowledge the decrees of Trent, or to submit to the authority of the Bishop of Rome,—England has been regarded and treated as a *heathen* country,—a country whose conversion was to be attempted by Missionary Bishops and Priests (Q). Is not this a case for the application of our Lord’s test,—“ *By their fruits ye shall know them?*”—and may it not fairly be asked whether—the world at large being our judge—England has, during the last three hundred

years, *i. e.* since the Reformation, been so much behind the countries of the Roman obedience in works of charity and beneficence, in the tone of its literature, its efforts and sacrifices for the improvement of the human race, or the moral character of its people generally? I would almost venture to assert that, within the last twenty years, more churches have been built to the honour and worship of Almighty God in this country, than in all the rest of Europe put together.

But if Rome can show neither greater purity of faith, nor more abundant “fruits of the Spirit,” what claim can she possibly have to our spiritual allegiance, and what justification of her late most wanton and insolent aggression? But perhaps we should repress the feeling of indignation at her treatment of our Church, or her usurpation of the prerogative of our Sovereign, when we remember that the assumed Supremacy of the Pope is in point of fact no less than a usurpation of the throne of our Divine Lord and King.

But I must conclude. Time would not allow me to examine pretensions as impious as they are utterly unfounded. I would only say further, that what has now been offered must not be regarded as a piece of gratuitous controversy, or an unprovoked attack upon another communion. I know how little edifying is the discussion of theological differences, and how much less calculated to

confirm our faith than to impair our charity. Recent well-known acts, however, of the Court of Rome leave us no alternative but to deny their validity, as well as the usurped authority from which they proceed. Christ is our King ; we acknowledge no vicegerent upon earth. His Word, as taught by his chosen Apostles, under the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is our law ; and we prefer as its interpreter the Creeds and the general judgment of the early Church, to the pretended infallibility of the Pope, or the modern theory of development. In this faith, the faith as held and taught in the Church of England, I bid you, in the Apostle's words, "to stand fast;" and, whatever be the trials in store, to "quit you like men." There is need of watchfulness; there is need of constancy. We must not be fretted by impatience at the wrongs done to our own Church, or moved by its imperfections and shortenings to overlook the much more grievous errors and backslidings of the Church of Rome. We must not allow ourselves to trifle with the great questions which are at issue. Faith and religion are not matters of taste and the fine arts, and we must not suffer ourselves to be offended because every thing in our communion, in its architecture, its services, or its vestments, is not quite to our mind. Rely upon it, if we are not in the true ark of God, none is to be found upon earth. It has conveyed in safety, we cannot doubt, the saints and holy men,

our fathers of many preceding generations, through the waves of this troublesome world to the haven of their eternal rest. Let us, then, not be fearful or faithless. The storm may rise, and the waves beat high; but we have abundant tokens that the Lord, even the Captain of our Salvation, is with us in the ship.

APPENDIX.

A, p. 12.

MEANING OF THE BULL OF POPE PIUS IX.

THAT there may be no mistake as to the nature and extent of the Pope's claims, the following frank avowal of the Paris *Univers*, the organ of the Ultra-montane party in France, authenticated by the signature of its editor, M. Jules Gondon, is here given. After quoting the Bishop of London's words, that the brief was a denial of the Queen's authority, of the English Episcopacy, of the validity of our orders, and a claim of spiritual jurisdiction over our whole Christian population, the *Univers* continues:—

“The brief of Pius IX. is, in fact, nothing less than that. The Bishop of London exactly appreciates its bearing. Just as St. Gregory transferred the Primacy from London to Canterbury; as Popes Boniface and Honorius confirmed this change, so Pius IX. transfers to-day the Primacy of Canterbury to the new Archiepiscopal See of Westminster. It is by virtue of the authority bequeathed to him by his predecessors that the Pope substitutes for the See of London that of Southwark, and abolishes all the ancient Sees erected in England by the Popes who have preceded him in the chair of St. Peter. Consequently, from the promulgation of the brief, there exists neither See of Canterbury, nor of York, nor of London, nor any of the Sees established anterior to the Reformation. The personages who shall for the

future assume the titles of Archbishop of Canterbury, and Bishop of London, will be mere intruders, schismatic Prelates, without any spiritual authority. . . . Yes; the act of *supremacy* just exercised by Pius IX. denies the existence in England of all other spiritual authority save his own." — *Guardian*, Nov. 6, 1850.

B, p. 14.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

TESTIMONY OF ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT.

"This I dare boldly affirm, that all points of religion necessary to Salvation, and touching either the mystery of our Redemption in Christ, or the right use of the Sacraments, and true manner of worshipping God, are as purely and perfectly taught, and by public authority established, in this Church of England at this day, as ever they were in any Church since the Apostles' time."—*Preface to the Defence of the Answer*, fol. 1574.

TESTIMONY OF BISHOP SANDERSON (1662) IN HIS LAST WILL.

"And here I do profess, that as I have lived, so I desire and (by the grace of God) resolve to die in the Communion of the Catholic Church of England; which, as it stands by law established, to be both in doctrine and worship agreeable to the Word of God, and in the most, and most material points of both, conformable to the faith and practice of the Godly Churches of Christ in the primitive and purer times, I do firmly believe; led so to do, not so much from the force of custom and education (to which the greatest part of mankind owe their particular different persuasions in point of religion), as upon the clear evidence of truth and reason, after a serious and impartial examination of the grounds, as well of Popery as Puritanism, according to that measure of understanding, and those opportunities which God hath afforded me: and herein I am abundantly satisfied that the schism which the Papists on the one hand, and the superstition which the Puritans on the other hand, lay to our charge, are very

justly chargeable upon themselves respectively. Wherefore I humbly beseech Almighty God, the Father of mercies, to preserve the Church by His power and Providence in peace, truth, and godliness, evermore to the world's end."—*Walton's Lives*, Oxf. Edit., 1824, p. 331.

TESTIMONY OF BISHOP BEVERIDGE.

"Men, brethren, and fathers, give me leave to speak freely to you of the Church you live in ; a Church not only in doctrine and discipline, but in all things else exactly conformable to the Primitive, the Apostolic, the Catholic Church."—*Sermon on the Form of Sound Words*. Horne's Edit. of works, vol. ii. p. 206.

C, p. 14.

BISHOP JEWEL'S CHALLENGE.

"The words that I there spake, as neere as I can call them to minde, were these :

" ' If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic Doctor or Father ; or out of any old Generall Councell ; or out of the Holy Scriptures of God ; or any one example of the Primitive Church, whereby it may be cleerely and plainly proved—

" ' That there was any private mass in the whole world at that time, for *the space of six hundred yeeres after Christ* ;

" ' Or that there was then any Communion ministered unto the people under one kind ;

" ' Or that the people had their Common Praiers then in a strange tongue, that they understood not ;

" ' Or that the Bishop of Rome was then called an Universall Bishop, or the Head of the Universall Church ;

" ' Or that the people was then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the Sacrament ;

“ ‘ Or that his body is, or may be, in a thousand places, or more, at one time ;

“ ‘ Or that the Priest did then hold up the Sacrament over his head ;

“ ‘ Or that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honour ;

“ ‘ Or that the Sacrament was then, or now ought to be hanged up under a Canopie ;

“ ‘ Or that in the Sacrament after the words of Consecration there remaineth only the accidents and shewes, without the substance of bread and wine ;

“ ‘ Or that the Priest had divided the Sacrament in three, and afterward received himself all alone ;

“ ‘ Or that whosoever had said the Sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ’s body, had therefore been judged for a heretike ;

“ ‘ Or that it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten, or five masses said in one Church in one day ;

“ ‘ Or that images were then set up in the Churches to the intent the people might worship them ;

“ ‘ Or that the lay people was then forbidden to read the word of God in their owne tongue.’

“ If any man alive were able to prove any of these articles, by any one cleere or plaine clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures, or of the old Doctors, or of any old Generall Councell, or by an Example of the Primitive Church ; I promised then that I would give over, and subscribe to him.”—*Jewel’s Sermon at Paul’s Cross*, 1560.

D, p. 14.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

“ The Catholic Faith flourished 1200 years in the world before ‘Transubstantiation was defined among yourselves. Persons better acquainted with the primitive times than yourself do acknowledge that the Fathers did not touch either the word or the matter of

Transubstantiation. Mark it well, neither name nor thing.”—*Abp. Bramhall's Answer to M. de la Milletière*, Works, vol. i. p. 24. Oxford edit. 1842.

“ I speak it deliberately, and after having spent many years in endeavouring to investigate the real constitution and tenets of the Sub-Apostolic Church, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was entirely unknown to it; that it is a comparatively modern doctrine; that the doctrine of the Primitive Church, as testified by primitive writers, is as nearly as can be that of our own; namely, that the Holy Communion is a most lively commemoration of Christ's *Sacrifice*, and a means whereby the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful.”—*Four Sermons before the University of Cambridge*, in Nov., 1849, by the Rev. J. J. Blunt, B.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity.

E, p. 15.

DENIAL OF THE CUP TO THE LAITY.

“ Indeed, that the Romanists have no ground in Scripture or primitive antiquity, to rob the laity of one-half of the Communion, is plainly confessed by that very Council which first established this sacrilege: I mean the Council of Constance. For the Fathers of that Council (if it be lawful to give that venerable title to a sorry conventicle of men so wholly regardless of the command of Christ, and the practice of the Apostolic Church, yea, of the whole Church of God for many ages after) in express terms acknowledge, that Christ instituted the Sacrament to be received in both kinds; yea, that it was so administered and received in the Primitive Church; yet, with a *non obstante*, notwithstanding all this, they boldly and blasphemously decree against Communion in both kinds, as a thing dangerous and scandalous; and the decree denounceth Excommunication to the Priest that shall dare to administer the Sacrament as Christ appointed. I wrong them not. All this is plainly de-

livered in the 13th Session of that Council.”—*Bishop Bull’s Vindication of the Church of England*. Oxford Edition of Works, vol. ii. pp. 178, 179. Edit. 1827.

F, p. 15.

PRAYERS IN LATIN.

“I would name as another abuse the ministration of the prayers of the Church in an unknown tongue, nothing being plainer or admitting of stronger proof, both from primitive Fathers and primitive Liturgies, than that in the Early Church the service was congregational; the people themselves very large sharers in it (as they are in our own); that they made the responses to the appeal of the Minister, ‘Lift up your hearts,’ *e. g.* ‘We lift them up unto the Lord;’ took their alternate parts in the Psalms; and, in short, were actively engaged in the whole function in a manner totally irreconcilable with the language of their devotions being any other than their own.”—*Blunt’s University Sermons*, 1849, p. 38.

“The following decree was enacted at the Fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215), which is invested by the Romanists with the character and authority of a General Council:—‘Because in most parts there are within the same state or diocese people of different languages mixed together, having under one faith various rites and customs, we distinctly charge that the Bishops of these states or dioceses provide proper persons to celebrate the Divine offices, and administer the Sacraments of the Church according to the differences of rites and languages, instructing them both by word and by example.’”—*Perceval on the Roman Schism*, p. 141.

“The Council of Trent, on the other hand, decided, that ‘although the Mass contains much instruction for the faithful people, yet it did not seem good to the Fathers that it should be every where celebrated in the common tongue.’”—*Ibid.* p. 307.

G, p. 16.

IMAGE-WORSHIP.

Mr. Tyler concludes a long and elaborate treatise on the subject, by recapitulating the points which he had established, and which would justify the use of stronger language than has been employed in the text.

“ I. That the religious worship of any material or visible representation of an absent object of adoration was contrary to the letter and spirit both of the Old and the New Testament.

“ II. That ‘ the worship of any image representing the Deity, or our Blessed Saviour as God and man, or any Saint or Angel, or the Virgin Mary, is contrary to the doctrine, and discipline, and practice of the Christian Church for more than seven hundred years.’

“ III. That for the first three hundred years no images of any kind were suffered to be placed in the Christian Churches ; and that through the next four hundred years, though portraits of departed Saints and living members of the Church were admitted, no religious worship was on any account to be paid to any such image.

“ The Second Council of Nice, A.D. 794, decreed that images must not only be used and honoured, but must also be worshipped ; condemning with bitter anathemas those who should refuse to worship them. The words of the Council are : ‘ All persons who profess to honour the sacred images, but refuse to worship them, do dishonour them, and are guilty of hypocrisy ; but we must not worship the images with *latria*—the supreme Divine worship due only to God Almighty.’ The Roman Pontifical declares that this *latria*, or supreme Divine adoration, is due to the Cross ; and the Roman Ritual of the present day contains the following prayers and ascriptions : ‘ Hail ! O thou Cross ! our only hope. To the pious do thou multiply grace, and for the guilty blot out their sins. O thou Cross ! do thou save the present congregation assembled for thy praise.’ ”—*Tyler on Image-Worship*, p. 254.

H, p. 16.

ROMANISM AS IT IS.

“As to the present authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, to judge by what we see of it in public, I think it goes very far indeed to substitute another Gospel for the true one.

“Instead of setting before the soul the Holy Trinity, and Heaven and Hell, it does seem to me as a popular system to preach the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints, and Purgatory. If ever there was a system which required reformation, it is that of Rome at this day, or in other words (as I should call it) Romanism or Popery.”—*Rev. J. H. Newman's Letter to Dr. Jelf in Explanation of Tract XC.* Oxford, 1841.

Mr. Newman quotes the following words of his own, and which he had used a year before :—

“In the Roman Schools we find St. Mary and the Saints the prominent objects of regard and dispensers of mercy, Purgatory or Indulgences the means of obtaining it, the Pope the ruler and teacher of the Church, and miracles the warrant of doctrine.”

I, p. 17.

WITHHOLDING THE BIBLE FROM THE PEOPLE.

“The Scriptures, even in the Latin version, had long become a sealed book to the people; and the Roman see, in proportion as it extended its supremacy, discouraged or proscribed the use of such vernacular versions as existed. This it did, not lest the ignorant and half-informed should mistake the sense of Scripture, nor lest the presumptuous and the perverse should deduce new errors in doctrine, and more fatal consequences in practice, from its distorted language; but in the secret and sure consciousness that what was now taught as Christianity, was not to be found in the written Word of God.”—*Southey's Book of the Church*, 4th Edit., p. 172.

The Rev. Hobart Seymour states that he could not procure a

single copy of the Holy Scriptures in the Roman language, and of a portable size, in the whole city of Rome ; and that when he asked the booksellers the reason of their not having the Sacred Volume, the answer was, in every instance, “ It is prohibited.”—*Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome*, p. 133. Seeleys.

K, p. 17.

WORSHIP OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

The result of Mr. Tyler's learned investigation is this, “ that in the Church of Rome prayer unequivocal and direct is addressed to the Virgin Mary for her intercession, and for her patronage, and assistance, and spiritual graces ; that God is petitioned to grant the requests of those who pray to Him, for the sake of Mary, through her merits and intercession ; that spiritual praises are offered to her for past benefits, and hymns are sung to her glory ; that believers are taught to depend upon her as the anchor of their souls, and to devote themselves by a solemn act of religion to her service as the Queen of Heaven, the Spouse of God.”

A patient and conscientious inquiry into the belief and practice of the Primitive Church has enabled him to assert that the remains of Christian antiquity, and the records of the early Councils for the first “ five hundred years and more, and in every country in the Eastern and in the Western Empire, in Europe, in Africa, and in Asia, testify as with one voice that they know of no belief in the present power of the Virgin, and her influence with God ; no practice, in public or private, of praying to God through her mediation, or of invoking her for her good offices of intercession, and advocacy, and patronage ; no offering of thanks and praise made to her ; no ascription of Divine honour and glory to her name. On the contrary, all the writers through those ages testify that God was to the early Christians the only object of prayer ; that to them Christ was the only heavenly Mediator and Intercessor in whom they put their trust.”—*Tyler*

on the Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary, pp. 362, 363. Rivingtons.

L, p. 18.

PURGATORY—INDULGENCES.

Purgatory was first made an article of faith in the fifteenth century, at the Council of Florence, A. D. 1438. It was unknown to the Primitive Church, and has never to this day been admitted by the Greek Church. On this doctrine, namely, that there is a place where the souls of true penitents are purified by fire, or other painful process, the impious doctrine of *Indulgences* is founded, by which the Romish Church (Council of Trent, 1563) claims the power of shortening the duration of purgatorial punishment, or of remitting it altogether. It assumes also to possess a treasure of merits, from works of supererogation and holiness beyond what God requires for salvation, which it has the power of applying to whom it may think fit, for the remission of the fires of Purgatory, or the torments of Hell. It is well known that these indulgences, so far from being scrupulously confined by the Pope, or his representatives, to the devoutly contrite and penitent, were made objects of shameless barter and merchandise; and this flagrant abuse was the immediate provocative of the Reformation in Germany.

The following is Professor Blunt's account of the sale of Indulgences in the time of Leo X.—“Tetzel, a Dominican monk, was commissioned by the Pope, who wished to recruit his treasury, whether for the supply of his extravagance, or the erection of his Church, or the prosecution of his war against the Turks, to put up his Indulgences for sale in Germany. Tetzel executed his trust with the most shameless contempt of all decency. There was no sin however monstrous (and some he named), which he had not both the will and the power to remit. It was in vain for the German Pastors to insist on Penance: here was a Papal Missionary at hand, ready to absolve from all pains and penalties. The Indulgences were farmed; they were sold

in the gross to the best bidders—and were by them dispersed among the retail pedlers of pardons, who resorted to the public-houses, exhibited their wares, and picked the pockets of the credulous. Extravagance like this called up Luther, &c.”—*Sketch of the Reformation in England*, p. 98.

“ Now the doctrine of Indulgences as it was before the Council of Trent, and hath since been taught in the Church of Rome, is big with gross errors. It depends on the fiction of Purgatory; it supposeth a superfluity of the satisfactions of the Saints, which being jumbled together (*horresco referens*) with the merits and satisfaction of our Saviour, make up one treasury of the Church; that the Bishop of Rome keeps the key of it, as having the sole power of granting Indulgences, either by himself or by others commissioned from him; lastly, it very absurdly extends the effect of the power of the keys, left by Christ in his Church, to men in the other world. Is not this a doctrine worthy of a place in our Creed, and to be made an article of the Catholic faith?—That the doctrine and use of Indulgences were never heard of in the Church of Christ for many hundreds of years is certain, and confessed too by divers learned men of the Roman Communion.”—*Bull's Works*, vol. ii. p. 283. Edit. 1827.

M, p. 18.

INVOCATION OF ANGELS AND SAINTS.

The Romish Church enjoins it as a duty of the faithful to pray to the Saints for their intercession with Christ; and, practically, there can be no doubt that in numberless cases this injunction to address them as reigning with Christ in Heaven, and to kneel before their images, has led to the worshipping of them, and the making them mediators, if not Gods. Such, however, is the teaching of the Council of Trent; and the awful sentence is added: ‘ If any shall teach or think contrary to these decrees, let him be accursed.’

This then, be it remembered, is the decree of a portion of

the Church at the period of its greatest corruption, A.D. 1563. I now beg the reader's serious attention to a decree of the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 367.—

“ ‘ It does not behove Christians to leave the Church of God, and go and invoke angels, and make assemblies : which things are forbidden. If, therefore, any one be detected idling in their secret idolatry, let him be accursed, because he has forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and gone to idolatry.’ ”—*Perceval on the Roman Schism.* p. 40.

N, p. 18.

THE THEORY OF DEVELOPMENT.

A Roman Catholic reviewer of Mr. Newman's Essay, Dr. Brownson, of the United States, shows that it contains principles directly subversive of Christianity :—

“ The Theory excludes even the possibility of faith by denying *quoad nos* the possibility of an Infallible Revelation. . . . The real question which Mr. Newman raises is not the possibility of Development, but the possibility of Revelation.”—*Brownson's Quarterly Review*, quoted in the *English Review*, No. XVII. (March, 1848.)

For a most masterly treatment of this subject the reader is referred to the “ Letters on the Development of Christian Doctrine ” of the late Rev. W. Archer Butler : Hodges and Smith, Dublin.

O, p. 20.

PAPAL SUPREMACY.

“ ‘ That the Bishop of Rome is the Vicar of Christ,’ *i. e.* under Christ, the head and governor of the universal Church, is another gross untruth. The universal pastorship and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome over all other Bishops was never heard of, never pretended to, by any Bishop of that Church, for the first six hundred years and more, as I have before shown. To which all

that I shall now add concerns our British Church. We say, then, our Church of Britain was never under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome for the first six hundred years, Britain being a distinct diocese of the empire, and consequently having a Primate of her own, independent upon any other Primate or Metropolitan."—*Bp. Bull*, vol. ii. p. 290.

"I would name as another abuse, the usurped authority of the Bishop of Rome over the Universal Church of Christendom; a feature of the Church of Rome, like so many others, the growth of later times: documents, of a date within the three first centuries being in existence, which contain as free-spoken remonstrances, on the part of Bishops, against the unauthorised claims of the Bishop of Rome, as any which Luther himself launched. Cyprian is full of them."

"The sixth Canon of the Council of Nice (A.D. 325) provides that each Metropolitan shall have the rule in his own Province, such having ever been the custom."—*Blunt's Four Sermons*, p. 44.

P, p. 20.

INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPES.

"Was *Marcellinus* such an infallible judge when he burned incense to idols? or *Liberius* when he consented to the Arians, and gave his suffrage to the condemnation of the blessed Athanasius? or *Honorius* when he was condemned and accursed in the Sixth General Council, for a Monothelite? or John XXII. when he was condemned by the Theologues of Paris, before the king, with sound of trumpets, for teaching that the souls of the just shall not see God before the general resurrection? Were those succeeding Popes, *John* and *Martin*, and *Formosus* and *Stephen*, and *Romanus* and *Theodorus*, and *John* and *Benedictus*, and *Sergius*, who clashed one with another, and abrogated the decrees one of another, over and over again, such infallible judges?"—*Bramhall. Vindication of the Church of England*, in Anglo-Catholic library, vol. i. p. 255.

“Pope Sixtus V., in A. D. 1590, published an edition of the Latin Vulgate Bible, which he commanded, by a Bull, should be received by all as true, legitimate, and undoubted; and that all future editions should be made conformable to this edition, on pain of the greater excommunication. It was found, however, to be so incorrect, that only two years afterwards, Pope Clement VIII. revoked the edition of Sixtus V. and published a revised edition, in which he introduced upwards of two thousand corrections.”—*Hartwell Horne's Introduction*, vol. ii. p. 236, 7th Edit.

Q, p. 20.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE BRITISH CHURCH.

“For the Britannic Churches it is evident that for six hundred years they never acknowledged any dependence upon Rome. When Austin the monk came into England, and pleaded with the British Bishops (seven in number) for subjection to the Bishop of Rome, and conformity to the Roman rites, in the observation of Easter and some other things; he was answered positively, that they owed no obedience to the Pope of Rome, but were under the government of the Bishop of Caerleon upon Usk, who was their overseer, under God.”—*Bingham's Antiquities*, iii. p. 27.

ENFORCED AURICULAR CONFESSION.

“I had forgot to say a word of Confession, which you mention as an advantage in the Church of Rome, which is not to be had in ours. But it may be had in our Communion, by any who please to have it; and I admit it may be very usefully practised. But, as it is managed in the Church of Rome, I apprehend it doth infinitely more mischief than good. Their casuistry seemeth a disgrace, not only to Christianity, but even to the light of nature.”—*Bishop Berkeley's Letter to Sir J. James*, 1741, p. 27. Rivingtons.

DOCTRINE OF THE PRIEST'S INTENTION.

“ If any shall say that there is not required in the Ministers, while they perform and confer the Sacraments, at least the intention of doing what the Church does, let him be accursed.”—*Council of Trent*, Sess. VII. Can. xi.

“ The security and repose of souls is pretended, or promised, to be had in the bosom of the Roman Church. But, I think, least of all to be hoped for, in a Church which, by her *doctrine of the Priest's intention being necessary to the efficacy of Sacraments*, must raise in every thinking member infinite and indissoluble scruples. Since it is acknowledged that many Infidels and Jews and Mahometans have been ordained, and possessed all degrees of dignity, and administered all Sacraments, in the Church of Rome: therefore, all Sacraments, derived either mediately or immediately from such, were ineffectual: Therefore, no particular member can know, upon the principles of the Church of Rome, whether he is a Christian or not: Therefore, that very Church, which sets up above all others for making men easy and secure within her communion, is, indeed, more than any other, calculated for producing doubts and scruples, such as I do not see possible how they should be solved or quieted upon her principles.”—*Bishop Berkeley's Letter to Sir J. James*, p. 19.

CANON OF SCRIPTURE.—THE APOCRYPHA.

The Council of *Laodicea* (A. D. 367) furnished a list of the Canonical Books of Scripture, from which what we call the Apocrypha is omitted. The Council of *Trent* (A. D. 1564) pronounces the Apocryphal Books Canonical, and anathematises all who shall not receive them entire, with all their hearts.

THE END.

